

CASE NO.: AM9-98-080C
Serial No.: 09/551,745
March 25, 2004
Page 7

PATENT
Filed: April 18, 2000

Remarks

Reconsideration of the above-captioned application is requested. All pending claims except 5 and 12 (which have been indicated as being allowable) have been rejected either as being anticipated by Yamato et al. or obvious over Yamato et al. in view of secondary references.

To overcome the rejections, Claim 1 has been amended to remove certain material and replace it with the allowable subject matter of Claim 5. Likewise, Claim 8 has been amended to remove certain material and replace it with the allowable subject matter of Claim 12. These claims will not further addressed.

The remaining two independent claims (17 and 22) have been amended to recite subject matter disclosed on page 10 of the specification and believed to patentable over the art of record, namely in the case of Claim 17 serving a request of a lower priority before a request of a later-arriving but higher priority, if a lower priority request queue is sufficiently short such that the lower priority request can be satisfied first, and the higher priority request satisfied within its priority. Claim 22 sets forth combining a priority with ordering based on an internal state of the associated disk. Neither of these limitations is believed to be taught or suggested in the relied-upon references.

Applicant does not necessarily acquiesce in the allegations in the Office Action. For example, Applicant does not acquiesce that Yamato et al. teaches terminating requests. All that Yamato et al. teaches is that they can expire, not that they are affirmatively terminated.

1053-32C, AM3

CASE NO.: AM9-98-080C
Serial No.: 09/551,745
March 25, 2004
Page 8

PATENT
Filed: April 18, 2000

Respectfully submitted,



John L. Rogitz
Registration No. 33,549
Attorney of Record
750 B Street, Suite 3120
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1053-32C.AM)